REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1-2, 9, 12 and 14-15 have been amended. Claims 13 and 16-30 have been

cancelled without prejudice. New claims 31-35 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-

12, 14-15 and 31-35 are presented for examination. The following remarks are in

response to the Board's Decision on Appeal of July 23, 2009.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable

over George Coulouris, et al., *Distributed Systems Concepts and Design, Second Ed.,* pp.

165-194 and 300-308 (Addison-Wesley 1994) ("Coulouris"), Abraham Silberschatz, et

al., *Operating System Concepts, Fifth Ed.*, pp. 94, 264, 267, 270,-272, 289, 293, 402-405

and 444-445, ("Silberschatz") and Summers, U.S. Patent No. 6,098,133 ("Summers").

The proposed amendments and the following remarks are in response to the Decision on

Appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Please consider the following:

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

>   A method comprising:
>   maintaining a first page table map for use in an isolated execution
> mode and a second page table map for use in a normal execution mode;
>   restricting access to an isolated area of memory to bus cycles
> performed in the isolated execution mode by a processor operating in the
> isolation execution mode by a processor operating in the isolation
> execution mode, the memory having a protected audit log to preserve
> fingerprints identifying events being processed in the isolated execution
> modes, the audit log to further preserve information associated with the
> events, the information proving current status of the isolated execution
> modes;
>   dynamically swapping between the first page table map and the
> second page table map responsive to a change in execution mode;
>   identifying if an event is one of a class of events to be handled in
> the isolated execution mode;
>   asserting a selection signal to select the first page table map if the
> event is identified as one of the class of events to be handled in the
> isolated execution mode; and

handling the event using a table map selected by the selection signal
(emphasis added)

As an initial matter, in light of the new proposed amendments, the Examiner's rejection of the pending claims is moot. Without any concessions regarding this rejection, Applicants submit that claim 1, in pertinent part, recites "<u>memory having a protected audit log to preserve fingerprints identifying events being processed in the isolated execution modes, the audit log to further preserve information associated with the events, the information proving current status of the isolated execution modes</u>" (emphasis added).

Coulouris, *Silberschatz* and *Summers*, neither individually nor when combined teach or reasonably suggest at least these limitations of claim 1. For example, *Summers* permits an interface card to be disconnected from the bus when sensitive data is being carried by the bus, so that the card cannot observe or alter the data. This has the *effect of interrupting communications between the card and the memory* (see Figure 1; see also col. 3, line 54 thru col. 4, line 8) and in no way includes "<u>memory having a protected audit log to preserve fingerprints identifying events being processed in the isolated execution modes, the audit log to further preserve information associated with the events, the information proving current status of the isolated execution modes</u>" as recited by claim 1. *Coulouris* and *Silberschatz*, like *Summers*, neither individually nor when combined in any combination teach or reasonably suggest at least the recited limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable

over Takahashi, U.S. Patent No. 5,615,263 ("Takahashi") and Summers, U.S. Patent No. 6,098,133 ("Summers").

Claims 9-15 are alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Poisner, U.S. Patent No. 5,729,760 ("Poisner") and Summers, U.S. Patent No. 6,098,133 ("Summers").

Claims 9 and 12 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 12 and their dependent claims.

New Claim

New claim 31 depends from claim 1 and thus includes all the limitations of the base claims. Accordingly, Applicants contend claim 31 is allowable over the cited references.

New independent claim 32 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants contend that claim 32 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: <u>September 23, 2009</u>   <u>/Aslam A. Jaffery/</u>
Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980